



BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

1 S. Main St., 9th Floor
Mount Clemens, Michigan 48043
586-469-5125 FAX 586-469-5993
macombcountymi.gov/boardofcommissioners

PLANNING AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

TUESDAY, JUNE 10, 2008

AGENDA

1. Call to Order
2. Pledge of Allegiance
3. Adoption of Agenda
4. Approval of Minutes Dated 03-11 and 04-08-08 (previously distributed)
5. Public Participation
6. Presentation on Proposed Macomb County Smart Zone/Incubator (mailed)
7. Presentation on Gratiot Avenue Access Management Plan (mailed)
8. Presentation on Macomb County Development Certification Program (mailed)
9. Executive Director's Report (mailed)
10. New Business
11. Public Participation
12. Adjournment

MEMBERS: Vosburg-Chair, Mijac-Vice Chair, Camphous-Peterson, DeSaele, Duzyj, DiMaria, Drolet, Brdak, Rengert, Brown, Haggerty, Roberts, Gielegghem and Crouchman (ex-officio)

MACOMB COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

William A. Crouchman
District 23
Chairman

Dana Camphous-Peterson
District 18
Vice-Chair

Leonard Haggerty
District 21
Sergeant-At-Arms

Andrey Duzyj - District 1
Marvin E. Sauger - District 2
Phillip A. DiMaria - District 3
Jon M. Switalski - District 4
Susan L. Doherty - District 5

Joan Flynn - District 6
Sue Rocca - District 7
David Flynn - District 8
Robert Mijac - District 9
Phillis DeSaele - District 10

Ed Szczepanski - District 11
Peter J. Lund - District 12
Don Brown - District 13
Brian Brdak - District 14
Keith Rengert - District 15

Carey Torrice - District 16
Ed Bruley - District 17
Paul Gielegghem - District 19
Kathy Tocco - District 20

Betty Slinde - District 22
Sarah Roberts - District 24
Kathy D. Vosburg - District 25
Leon Drolet - District 26

RESOLUTION NO. _____ FULL BOARD MEETING DATE: _____

AGENDA ITEM: _____

MACOMB COUNTY, MICHIGAN

RESOLUTION TO: Resolution to receive and file the report of the Proposed Macomb County Smart Zone/Incubator

INTRODUCED BY: Kathy Vosburg, Chair, Planning and Economic Development Committee

DESCRIPTION:

COMMITTEE/MEETING DATE

PED 6-10-08

SmartZone Process – Timeline and Application Criteria

The Governor signed the SmartZone legislation April 23, 2008 that allows the following:

- Up to 3 new SmartZones to be designated by 12/31/2008.

Timeline to designate the 3 new SmartZones:

- a. Application Process will be released by MEDC on **5/22/2008**.
- b. Applications are due on **7/1/2008**.
- c. Applications must be submitted by the municipality where the SmartZone will be located.
- d. Applications will be reviewed by a team identified by MEDC.
- e. The new SmartZones will be announced by **11/1/2008**.
- f. The municipality and the LDFA must execute an agreement with MEDC by **12/31/2008** designating the SmartZone.

Proposals will be evaluated and assigned points based on the following criteria:

I. Business Plan of no more than 30 pages: (100 points) In the SmartZone Application scoring process, items A through E are eligible to receive up to 50 points; items F, up to 30 points; and item G, up to 20 points. The evaluation of a well-developed plan will be based on the following criteria:

A. Technology vision and focus:

- Clearly identifies local technology assets
- Takes advantage of local resources
- Identifies short-term focus and long-term growth

B. Clear community support:

- Commitment from local government
- Commitment from private sector
- Commitment from economic development groups, other related non-profits

C. University, higher education institute, or private-based research institute partnerships:

- Commitment from the institution
- Role the institution(s) will play, especially which institution(s) provide the technology/intellectual property
- Access to students, faculty, and technology

D. Ability to provide support for entrepreneurs and new and small business:

- Clearly understands business acceleration and incubation services and what is needed
- Includes a plan to provide these services
- Will leverage others (SBTDC, etc.) to provide services when needed

E. Defined site available or ready for near-term development:

- Geographic location and boundaries of the proposed tax capture area

F. Financial Plan:

- Well-developed financial plan
- Addresses economic impact to local and State economies

- Projections for sustaining operations, including if Tax Increment Financing is a significant portion of the revenue model to achieve sustainability, a description of the plan to recruit or attract businesses into the zone that will generate revenue
- Financial Commitment from Partners for sustainable time frame

G. Management Team:

- Management team that includes skills and experience in this type of endeavor
- Members of management team have played a role in Michigan's technology sector (or other state/country) and are networked, connected to others

RECYCLABLE PAPER

RESOLUTION NO. _____ FULL BOARD MEETING DATE: _____

AGENDA ITEM: _____

MACOMB COUNTY, MICHIGAN

RESOLUTION TO: Resolution to receive and file the Presentation on the Gratiot Avenue Access Management Plan

INTRODUCED BY: Kathy Vosburg, Chair, Planning and Economic Development Committee

DESCRIPTION:

COMMITTEE/MEETING DATE

PED 6-10-08

MODEL MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING
Concerning Cooperative Intergovernmental Development
of an Access Management Plan

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The attached model Memorandum of Understanding is presented to implement the principles of access management included in the ***Access Management Guidebook*** published by the Michigan Department of Transportation (MDOT) in October 2001. It is premised on the recognition that many local land use decisions have an impact on abutting roads and that many MDOT, county, and local road improvement decisions have impacts on subsequent land use decisions. Since local governments have, for the most part, authority to make unilateral land use decisions outside the right-of-way of public roads under a variety of zoning, subdivision, land division, building, and related regulations, and since state, county, and local road authorities have, for the most part, unilateral authority to issue permits for driveway access across the right-of-way, and to make most road improvement decisions, the potential for local governments to make decisions that undermine the integrity of decisions by road authorities, or vice versa, is very great. The land use/transportation relationship can be mutually beneficial for state, county, and local governments, as well as for the private sector when decisions are coordinated. At the same time, this relationship can result in unnecessary problems and intergovernmental conflicts when the relationship is ignored. With demands for road improvements rising faster than available revenues and with land use changes creating the need for some road improvements, and undermining the integrity of others, the need for formal coordination between local governments and road authorities has never been greater. This model Memorandum of Understanding provides a mechanism for all affected governmental entities to work together in partnership to achieve common objectives and better serve the citizens and businesses of Michigan.

Rationale for a Coordinated Approach to Preparing an Access Management Plan

Concern about worsening traffic congestion in the communities of Eastpointe, Roseville, Mount Clemens, Clinton Township, Macomb Township, Chesterfield Township, New Haven, Lenox Township, and Richmond has led these communities to find ways to cooperate to effectively cope with this important aspect of quality of life for residents. The M-3/M-19 (Gratiot Avenue) Corridor is an arterial highway that links these communities in their business, educational, social, and recreational activities. The Corridor is characterized by growing traffic congestion, increasing safety concerns, and continued commercial, industrial, residential, and office development of land adjacent to the Corridor. A majority of the congestion and crashes experienced along the Corridor can be attributed to traffic conflicts associated with the location of driveways. Increasing traffic volumes and development pressures threaten to worsen existing problems. A cooperative and coordinated approach to access management planning will harmonize new development and redevelopment without exacerbating existing problems.

Therefore, the communities of Eastpointe, Roseville, Mount Clemens, Clinton Township, Macomb Township, Chesterfield Township, New Haven, Lenox Township, and Richmond, the Road Commission of Macomb County, the Macomb County Department of Planning and Economic Development, the Michigan Department of Transportation (MDOT), and the Southeast Michigan Council of Governments (SEMCOG) propose to develop an Access Management Plan along the Corridor. This Plan will provide a cooperative and coordinated approach to ingress and egress to planned and existing development along the Corridor. As a result, it will improve motorist and non-motorist safety, preserve the carrying capacity of the roadway, protect public investment, and enhance the overall aesthetic character of the Corridor. The Plan will contain parcel specific recommendations for retrofitting existing access to development — establishing access standards and a coordinated site plan approval process and identifying opportunities and strategies to replace direct access points with rear service drives, cross-access between parking areas, or shared driveways.

Given the length of the Corridor, the number of communities involved, and the differing characteristics along the Corridor, the Plan will be developed in two distinct segments using two separate — but similar, simultaneous, and coordinated — processes. The planning effort will be guided by a Steering Committee for each segment that includes representatives from each community in that segment, as well as representatives from the Road Commission of Macomb County, Macomb County Department of Planning and Economic Development, MDOT, and SEMCOG.

Following adoption of the Plan, each jurisdiction will be formally asked to adopt a community specific overlay land use plan, access standards, and an interagency

site plan review process to ensure subsequent land use and driveway permit decisions are made consistent with the Plan.

The following Resolution and Memorandum of Understanding are offered in view of the need for a cooperative and coordinated effort on the part of local governments along the Corridor. The Memorandum of Understanding should be viewed as a community and road authority commitment to participation in near- and long-term planning for the M-3/M-19 Corridor.

RESOLUTION # _____

WHEREAS the governing body of _____ (*name of the city, village, township or county*) with offices located at _____ (*address of city, village or township hall, or county building*) recognizes the need for coordinated planning along the M-3/M-19 (Gratiot Avenue) Corridor; and

WHEREAS the governing body of _____ (*name of the city, village, township or county*) recognizes the need to prepare and implement coordinated land use and access management standards along the M-3/M-19 (Gratiot Avenue) Corridor in the interest of all parties; and

WHEREAS the governing body of _____ (*name of the city, village, township or county*) has reviewed the Memorandum of Understanding which is attached hereto and made part hereof and which is agreed to by all parties who have signed it at the end;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the governing body of _____ (*name of the city, village, township or county*) hereby adopts the said Memorandum of Understanding as a policy document and instructs the staff and affected Boards and Commissions of _____ (*name of the city, village, township or county*) to implement the provisions thereof.

Adopted this _____ day of _____, 2008.

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING

THIS AGREEMENT is entered into effective as of the _____ day of _____ 2008, by and among the Cities of Eastpointe, Roseville, Mount Clemens, New Haven, and Richmond and the Townships of Clinton, Macomb, Chesterfield, and Lenox (hereafter referred to as "Local Governments"); the Road Commission of Macomb County (hereafter referred to as "Road Commission"); the Macomb County Department of Planning and Economic Development (hereafter referred to as "Planning Department"); and the Michigan Department of Transportation (hereafter referred to as the "Department"), all of said parties being referred to collectively herein as the "Agencies."

Purpose

The purpose of this Memorandum of Understanding is for Local Governments and road authorities along the M-3/M-19 (Gratiot Avenue) Corridor (hereafter referred to as the "Corridor") to voluntarily coordinate planning, land use, driveway permit, site plan review, and road improvement decisions. The Agencies recognize that planned orderly land development that is coordinated with road improvements results in less traffic congestion, safer operation, and a more efficient use of limited infrastructure resources. Equally important, cooperative planning will allow continued economic development by preserving and enhancing the safe and efficient movement of traffic.

Recitals

WHEREAS:

- A. Local Governments are authorized by planning, zoning, and land division enabling acts to regulate land use adjacent to public highways within their jurisdictions; and
- B. The Road Commission and Department are authorized under various state laws to provide for and maintain a road and highway system in Michigan and under PA 200 of 1969, as amended, to regulate access to the road and highway system; and
- C. The coordinated regulation of vehicular access to public highways is necessary to maintain the efficient and smooth flow of traffic, to reduce the potential for traffic crashes, to protect the functional level of roadways, to optimize traffic capacity, and to protect public health, safety and general welfare; and
- D. The Agencies desire to provide for the coordinated planning, regulation, and improvement of vehicular access between the road and abutting land for the section of the Corridor between 8 Mile Road and County Line Road, which is within the jurisdiction of the Agencies; and

NOW THEREFORE, the Agencies agree to voluntarily participate in a comprehensive, cooperative, and continuing planning process to prepare, adopt, and implement a comprehensive and mutually acceptable Access Management Plan for the Corridor (hereafter referred to as the "Plan") for the purposes above recited and as further detailed as follows:

1. A Corridor Steering Committee is established and all Agencies agree to appoint members who will diligently participate as members of the Committee. The Committee shall include one member appointed by the governing body of each community along the Corridor. The remaining members will consist of two members from the Department, and one member each from the Road Commission, Planning Department, and SEMCOG.
2. The Corridor Steering Committee shall direct the development of a conceptual Plan following the guidelines established in the Access Management Guidebook published by the Department in October 2001. The conceptual Plan shall be presented to the Steering Committee for review, comment, and consensus. The conceptual Plan shall be refined to reflect comments received and to include an overlay land use plan, recommended zoning ordinance language, and an interagency site plan review process. The refined Plan shall be provided to the governing body of each Local Government, the Road Commission, the Planning Department, and the Department office(s) involved in its preparation, and formally presented to each community's Planning Commission for review. The final Plan shall be presented to the governing body of each Local Government, the Road Commission, the Planning Department, and the Department office(s) involved in its preparation.
3. The Agencies agree that they will cooperate in the implementation of the Plan, including the overlay land use plan, recommended zoning ordinance language, and interagency site plan review process.
4. The Agencies agree that, insofar as authorized by law and local ordinance, they will cooperate in review of specific applications for a development or driveway permit that coordinates the decision so there is assurance the standards and requirements of all applicable Agencies are met prior to permit issuance by any one entity, including methods for conditioning approval of one permit upon receipt of a permit from another entity. It is further agreed that this will most commonly be achieved by a meeting of the Corridor Steering Committee called at the request of a local member of government to review and comment on any proposed rezonings, new Planned Unit Developments, or site plans for developments which may measurably affect the Corridor — unless a different procedure is established in the Plan.
5. The Agencies agree that insofar as authorized by law and local ordinance, vehicular access to the Corridor shall be permitted by the Agency(ies) having

jurisdiction only when such access is in compliance with the Plan for the Corridor, with PA 200 of 1969 as amended and any administrative rules or Department guidelines established to implement Act 200, with adopted local access management regulations, and with this Agreement.

6. Accesses which were in existence in compliance with Act 200 of 1969 as amended prior to the effective date of this Memorandum of Understanding may continue in existence until such time as a change in the access is required by Act 200, or by pertinent regulations of Local Governments. When closure, modification, or relocation of access is required, the Agency(ies) having jurisdiction shall utilize appropriate legal process to effect such action.
7. Actions taken by any Agency with regard to transportation planning and traffic operations within ¼-mile of the Corridor covered by this Agreement shall be in conformity with this Memorandum of Understanding. Design waivers may be approved if agreed upon by the Agencies to this Agreement according to the procedures established in the Plan.
8. Parcels of real property which adjoin the Corridor and were created after the effective date of the Plan created under this Agreement shall not be provided with direct access to the Corridor unless the location, use, and design thereof conform with the Plan prepared under this Agreement, and all applicable laws and regulations.
9. This Agreement is based upon and is intended to be consistent with Act 200 of 1969, as amended, and all administrative rules and guidelines established pursuant to it, as now or hereafter constituted. An amendment to either Act 200 or its administrative rules which becomes effective after the effective date of this Agreement and which conflicts irreconcilably with an express provision of this Agreement shall, to that extent, supersede the conflicting provision.
10. This Agreement does not create any current financial obligation for any Agency. Any future financial obligation of any Agency shall be subject to the execution of an appropriate encumbrance document, where required. This Agreement does not require any signatory to forego the exercise of any of its legal authority, powers, or obligations.
11. This Agreement is intended to facilitate cooperation in the exercise of the relevant powers of the signatories for their mutual benefit, but is not intended to deny any signatory of its ultimate legal authority to independently administer and enforce its laws, rules, and ordinances.
12. No portion of this Agreement shall be deemed to constitute a waiver of any immunities the parties or their officers or employees may possess, nor shall any portion of this Agreement be deemed to have created a duty of care

which did not previously exist with respect to any person not a party to this Agreement.

13. A signatory may withdraw from this Agreement following 30 days written notice to all other signatories of an intension to withdraw.

The undersigned Agencies, which are signatories to this Memorandum of Understanding, jointly and mutually agree to its terms and conditions.

City of Eastpointe

(name of person attesting)

Mayor

(Position: usually Clerk)

City of Roseville

(name of person attesting)

Mayor

(Position: usually Clerk)

City of Mount Clemens

(name of person attesting)

Mayor

(Position: usually Clerk)

Clinton Township

(name of person attesting)

Supervisor

(Position: usually Clerk)

Macomb Township

(name of person attesting)

Supervisor

(Position: usually Clerk)

Chesterfield Township

(name of person attesting)

Supervisor

(Position: usually Clerk)

City of New Haven

(name of person attesting)

Mayor

(Position: usually Clerk)

Lenox Township

(name of person attesting)

Supervisor

(Position: usually Clerk)

City of Richmond

(name of person attesting)

Mayor

(Position: usually Clerk)

Michigan Department of Transportation

Director

Concur:
Michigan Department of Transportation,
Metro Region

Director

Road Commission of Macomb County

Director

Macomb County Department of Planning and
Economic Development

Director

M-3/M-19 Gratiot Avenue Access Management

- Macomb County Department of
Planning and Economic
Development
- Southeast Michigan Council of
Governments
- Michigan Department of
Transportation

Presentation Outline

- What is Access Management?
- Why is Access Management Important?
- Scope of Gratiot Avenue Access Management
- Administrative Framework of Gratiot Avenue Access Management
- Local Community Role in Access Management
- Deliverables
- Gratiot Avenue Access Management Timeline
- Current Partners

What is Access Management?

- Access management is a set of techniques that state, county, and local governments can use to control access to a community's transportation network
- Access management includes several techniques that are designed to:
 - Reduce the number of crashes and improve safety
 - Reduce traffic congestion
 - Preserve the flow of traffic
 - Preserve the public investment in roads
 - Enhance the value of private land development

Why is Access Management Important?

- Vital relationship between land use and transportation.
- State, County, and local governments, as well as the private sector can greatly benefit from a coordinated and efficient relationship between land use and transportation.
- Demands for road improvements are rising faster than available revenues and with land use changes creating the need for improvements, the need for formal coordination between local governments, the County, and road authorities has never been greater.

Scope of Gratiot Avenue Access Management

- The Gratiot Avenue corridor traverses Macomb County from 8 Mile Road to County Line Road.
- The corridor is approximately 26 miles long and passes through nine communities:
 - Eastpointe, Roseville, Mount Clemens, Clinton Township, Macomb Township, Chesterfield Township, New Haven, Lenox Township, and the City of Richmond

Scope of Gratiot Avenue Access Management

- Given the length of the corridor, the number of communities involved, and the differing characteristics along the corridor, two access management plans will be developed using two separate but similar, simultaneous, and coordinated processes. The recommended breakpoint for the corridor is M-59.
- The vision for the southern segment will focus on retrofitting the existing urban landscape to accommodate access management techniques, while the vision for the northern segment will focus on proactively addressing growth before it occurs to minimize future problems.

Scope of Gratiot Avenue Access Management

- It is anticipated there will be a great deal of overlap between the two plans, and that the communities in one segment will have much to learn from those in the other.
- The ultimate goal in both segments is establishing a corridor-wide framework within which to review, discuss, evaluate, and mitigate redevelopment and development of the corridor into the foreseeable future.

Administrative Framework of Gratiot Avenue Access Management

- **MDOT Funded (No Cost to Your Community)**
- SEMCOG will act as project manager
- Macomb County staff will act as administrative support
- Private consultant(s) will develop the study, which will include:
 - Performing an inventory of existing conditions, including land use, zoning, traffic, and safety
 - Proposing model ordinances with coordinated site plan review and driveway permitting process
 - Developing a corridor overlay land use plan suggesting access modifications (e.g., driveway consolidations, frontage roads, etc.) that could improve corridor conditions when implemented

Local Community Role in Gratiot Avenue Access Management

- In order to initiate the process we are asking each community to pass the “Model Resolution” and sign the “Memorandum of Understanding” provided in the information packet supporting the Gratiot Avenue Access Management Initiative.
- Each community will be asked to provide one representative to sit on Access Management Steering Committee for their respective corridor segment. The Steering Committees will assist in the development and implementation of the initiative.

Local Community Role in Gratiot Avenue Access Management

- A key factor to the success of the Gratiot Avenue Access Management Initiative is for each community to adopt model ordinances which will be recommended at the end of the initial study.
- These ordinances will provide each community with the proper tools and techniques to remedy transportation and land use concerns along Gratiot and highlight opportunities for future growth and development.

Deliverables

- In the end, this planning effort will provide each community with a detailed plan on how to implement access management in their community. Implementing the plan will ultimately make the Gratiot Avenue corridor safer for the motoring public who use it for traveling to and from work, school, or shopping. By making it safer together we can enhance the attractiveness of the corridor both aesthetically and more importantly economically.

Gratiot Avenue Access Management Timeline

- May 5: release RFP
- June 6: bids due to SEMCOG
- June 9-13: review bids and select consultants to interview
- June 23-27: conduct consultant interviews
- June 30: select consultant
- July 25: SEMCOG Executive Committee (budget amendment, contract award)
- August 14: Access Management Educational Workshop
- August/September: MDOT Commission Audit (contract approval)
- October 1: contract begins

Current Partners



1900-2000

SEMCOG

... Equipping local government leaders for the future

Southeast Michigan Council of Governments



Resource Material

- Macomb County Department of Planning and Economic Development
 - www.macombcountymi.gov/mcped
- Southeast michigan Council of Governments
 - www.semcog.org
- Michigan Department of Transportation
 - http://www.michigan.gov/mdot/0,1607,7-151-9621_11041_29705---,00.html
- Federal Highway Administration
 - http://ops.fhwa.dot.gov/access_mgmt/what_is_accsmgmt.htm
 - <http://www.accessmanagement.info/10principles.html>

RECYCLABLE PAPER

RESOLUTION NO. _____ FULL BOARD MEETING DATE: _____

AGENDA ITEM: _____

MACOMB COUNTY, MICHIGAN

RESOLUTION TO: Resolution to receive and file the Update Report on the Macomb County Development Certification Program

INTRODUCED BY: Kathy Vosburg, Chair, Planning and Economic Development Committee

DESCRIPTION:

COMMITTEE/MEETING DATE

PED 6-10-08

SPARC

Site Plan Assistance Review Collaborative

6-10-08
Distributed

FILE

- Purpose** Ignite economic development in Macomb County communities. Michigan communities are struggling to compete for new business opportunities. This program is designed to help communities "get in shape" with regard to their development review processes. Up-to-date plans and ordinances that incorporate state-of-the-art practices will send the message to prospective developers that the community values development and is therefore a sound investment.
- Outcome** Participating communities will have an edge over other jurisdictions because they have prepared for new development and redevelopment opportunities.
- Process**
- 1) Develop Certification program
 - Host workshops to obtain input from local government and development community on development review challenges, and effective tools and techniques
 - Develop two to three levels of certification
 - 2) Assist communities with identifying Certification goals and achieving the goals
 - County receives commitment from the Community to participate in the program
 - County evaluates current planning tools and techniques
 - County and community develop a work program, which establishes target dates, responsibilities and certification level to be achieved
 - Progress is reviewed annually (or earlier if the community achieves goal before year's end)
 - It is anticipated that two pilot communities will be selected initially. The recommendation is for two distinct communities to contribute – one rural, one urban. Once two local governments have worked through the program, it will be evaluated and modified based on 'lessons learned,' and made available to all Macomb County communities.
 - 3) Marketing SPARC communities
 - As local governments successfully achieve SPARC certification, Macomb County will launch a campaign targeted at the business and development communities. The purpose of the campaign will be to promote the communities as ready for development and redevelopment opportunities.
 - 4) Program evaluation and modification
 - Modifications to the program are expected. Each participating government will be asked to evaluate the program annually (perhaps semi-annually initially).

RECYCLABLE PAPER

RESOLUTION NO. _____ FULL BOARD MEETING DATE: _____

AGENDA ITEM: _____

MACOMB COUNTY, MICHIGAN

RESOLUTION TO: Receive and File the Report from the Executive Director, Department of Planning and Economic Development, on departmental activities

INTRODUCED BY: Kathy Vosburg, Chair, Planning and Economic Development Committee

DESCRIPTION:

COMMITTEE/MEETING DATE

PEO 6-10-08

Copy #10

RED 6-10-08

Submitted
Office

Macomb County Economic Development

INVESTMENT UPDATE

Presented to:

**Macomb County Planning & Economic
Development Committee**

June 10, 2008

EDSG

2008 Client Investment

1/1/08 – 5/31/08

<u>CLIENT</u>	<u>LOCAL UNIT</u>	<u>INVESTMENT</u>	<u>JOB RETAINED</u>	<u>JOB CREATED</u>
21 st Century Graphic Tech.	Clinton Twp.	\$1,200,000	3	5
Macomb Printing	Clinton Twp.	\$900,500	27	3
Precision Boring	Clinton Twp.	\$1,500,000	40	5
Baker Machining	Macomb Twp.	\$21,800,000	24	18
CBS Boring & Machine	Mount Clemens	\$19,500,000	32	50
JB Cutting	Mount Clemens	\$1,600,000	30	6
Arin, Inc.	Roseville	\$800,000	20	9
Florence Cement	Shelby Twp.	\$2,600,000	140	0
General Dynamics	Shelby Twp.	\$6,000,000	0	400
Lube Power, Inc.	Shelby Twp.	\$6,400,500	50	60
Bleichert Co.	Sterling Heights	\$3,670,000	0	25
General Dynamics	Sterling Heights	\$2,600,000	0	75
Witzenmann USA	Warren	\$3,450,000	53	39
TOTALS		\$72,021,000	419	695

2008 Pending Client Investment

(Thru 5/31/08)

<u>CLIENT</u>	<u>LOCAL UNIT</u>	<u>INVESTMENT</u>	<u>JOB RETAINED [P]</u>	<u>JOB CREATED [P]</u>
C	Chesterfield Twp.	\$1,600,000	90	10
O	Clinton Twp.	\$3,500,000	15	10
N	Clinton Twp.	\$1,500,000	10	5
F	Fraser	\$3,200,000	40	5
I	Roseville	\$1,000,000	50	5
D	Roseville	\$5,600,000	40	10
E	Shelby Twp.	\$2,500,000	35	20
N	Sterling Heights	\$800,000	0	2
T	Sterling Heights	\$13,700,000	80	460
I	Warren	\$3,000,000	200	150
A	Warren	\$1,300,000	0	100
L	Warren	\$4,000,000	60	50
	Warren	\$1,600,000	90	5
TOTALS		\$43,300,000	710	832

2008 (Thru May 31)

Select Business Investment Successes

<u>CLIENT</u>	<u>COMMUNITY</u>	<u>INVESTMENT</u>	<u>JOB RETAINED</u>	<u>JOB CREATED</u>
Baker Machining	Macomb Twp.	\$21,800,000	24	18
Lube Power, Inc.	Shelby Twp.	\$6,400,500	50	60
Bleichert Co.	Sterling Heights	\$3,670,000	0	25
Witzenmann USA	Warren	\$3,450,000	53	39